

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

MARK W. DOBRONSKI

Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:24-cv-12512

v.

Brandy R. McMillion
United States District Judge

1-800-LAW-FIRM, PLLC,

Mag. Judge Kimberly G. Altman

Defendant.

_____/

**OPINION AND ORDER ADOPTING RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION OF
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION (ECF NO. 26) AND DENYING
MOTION TO DISMISS (ECF NO. 13), MOTION TO STAY (ECF NO. 14),
MOTION FOR ATTORNEY FEES (ECF NO. 15), AND MOTION FOR
SANCTIONS (ECF NO. 16)**

Plaintiff Mark W. Dobronski (“Plaintiff”) filed this *pro se* consumer protection action against Defendant 1-800-LAW-FIRM, PLLC (“Defendant”) alleging violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”), 47 U.S.C. § 227 *et seq.* See generally ECF No. 1. He claims that the Defendant has sent unauthorized text messages to him in violation of the TCPA. *Id.*

On October 23, 2024, this Court referred all pretrial matters to Magistrate Judge Kimberly G. Altman. ECF No. 8. On March 10, 2025, Defendant filed a Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 13), Motion to Stay (ECF No. 14), Motion for Attorney

Fees (ECF No. 15), and a Motion for Sanctions (ECF No. 16). Those motions were all fully briefed. *See* ECF Nos. 13-18, 20-25. On April 17, 2025, Magistrate Judge Altman issued a Report and Recommendation (R&R) recommending that the undersigned deny each of these motions. *See generally* ECF No. 26. At the end of the R&R, the Magistrate Judge advised the parties that to seek review of her recommendation, they had to file specific objections with the Court within 14 days of service of the R&R. *Id.* at PageID.357-358.

As of the date of this Order, May 13, 2025—27 days since the Magistrate Judge filed the R&R—neither party has filed objections to the R&R or contacted the Court to ask for more time to file objections. The failure to object to an R&R releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *see also Ivey v. Wilson*, 832 F.2d 950, 957-58 (6th Cir. 1987) (explaining that a party’s failure to timely object to a report and recommendation allows a court to accept the recommendation “without expressing any views on the merits of the magistrate’s conclusions”). Similarly, failure to object to an R&R forfeits any further right to appeal. *See Berkshire v. Dahl*, 928 F.3d 520, 530 (6th Cir. 2019) (recognizing that a party forfeits their right to appeal by failing to timely file objections to an R&R).

Accordingly, because no objections to the R&R have been filed, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's recommended disposition of Defendant's motions (ECF No. 26) is **ADOPTED**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 13), Motion to Stay (ECF No. 14), Motion for Attorney Fees (ECF No. 15), and Motion for Sanctions (ECF No. 16) are **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 13, 2025

s/Brandy R. McMillion
Hon. Brandy R. McMillion
United States District Judge